



APPLICATION NO.

09/822,156

United States Patent and Trademark Office

FILING DATE

03/28/2001

7590 BRIAN M. BERLINER, ESQ. O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

400 SOUTH HOPE STREET LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2899

06/22/2004

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

CONFIRMATION NO
6300
INER

PAPER NUMBER

ART UNIT 2126

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

Brian K. Schmidt

· ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/822,156	SCHMIDT, BRIAN K.
	Examiner	Art Unit
TI MANUA DATE A CALL	Edward Bross	2126
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply to period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 M	arch 2004.	
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	·	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		` '
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	
S. Patent and Trademark Office		

Art Unit: 2126

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims language is not clear for the following reasons:
 - a. Claim 1 lines 6, 7 and 9; claim 9 lines 4 and 5; claim 17 lines 9, 11, 13 and 14 "said capsule" should specifically read "said compute capsule".
 - b. Claim 1 lines 5, 7 and 10; claim 9 lines 6-8; claim 17 lines 9-11 and 15 "said processes" should specifically read "said interconnected processes".
 - c. Claim 1 line 9; claim 17 lines 12-13 It is unclear what is meant by "determining a state of said capsule".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-8 are directed towards "a method" whereas

Art Unit: 2126

they should be directed towards "a method in a computer system". Claims 9-16 are directed towards "a cache" whereas they should be directed towards "a computer system comprising a cache".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claim1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrimpf ("Migration of Processes, Files, and Virtual Devices in the MDX Operating System", pages 70-81, 1995).
- 7. As to claims 1, 9 and 17 Schrimpf discloses a method for caching an active computing environment comprising:
 - determining a state of said capsule (e.g. p. 77, section 5.3 first paragraph); and caching said processes and said state (e.g. p. 77 section 5.3)
- 8. Schrimpf does not disclose

encapsulating a plurality of interconnected processes into a compute capsule for representing said active computing environment;

encapsulating a system environment interconnected with said processes into said capsule;

Art Unit: 2126

obtaining said processes in said capsule;

However, obtaining desired information from a system to store in a single structure is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store data regarding the state of the processes and environment of Schrimpf in a capsule in order to simplify the access to and management of this data.

- 9. As to claims 2, 10 and 18, Schrimpf discloses relocating said active computing environment to a new location (e.g. p. 76, section 5.1 and p. 77 section 5.3).
- 10. As to claims 3, 11 and 19, Schrimpf discloses halting said active computing environment and re-starting said active computing environment in said new location using said state. (e.g. p 76 section 5.1 and p. 77 section 5.3).
- 11. As to claims 4, 12 and 20, Schrimpf discloses that the said state comprises and inter-process communication (IPC) state (e.g. p. 77 last paragraph).
- 12. As to claim 5, 13 and 21, Schrimpf discloses that the said state comprises a virtual memory state (e.g. p. 77 section 5.3)
- 13. As to claims 6, 14 and 22 Schrimpf discloses that the said state comprises a device state (e.g. p. 77 section 5.3).

Art Unit: 2126

14. As to claims 7, 15 and 23, Schrimpf discloses that the said state comprises a file system state (e.g. p. 77 section 5.3).

15. As to claims 8, 16 and 24, Schrimpf discloses that the said state comprises a central processing unit state (e.g. p. 77 section 5.3).

Response to Arguments

- 16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/822,156

Art Unit: 2126

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Bross whose telephone number is 305-8754. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EB

MENG-AL T. AN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100